

REMARKS

With respect to the finality of the rejection, it is believed that it is understood that the Section 112 objections and the Section 101 objections were not necessitated by the December, 2005 response and that, therefore, amendments to overcome these objections should be entered.


With respect to the Section 102 rejection based on Hosain, it is noted that the cited material in column 8 does indicate that Hosain was aware of mobility management state information and mobility management modes. However, the material cited at column 14 has nothing to do with taking any action dependent on the mobility management mode or state.

The cited material in column 8 simply explains the mobility management states. It never suggests to automatically close the packet data service application software if the mobility management state is idle.

Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 19, 2006


Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation